

Defence

Democracy

Secularism

KASHMIR

By

S. G. SARDESAI

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATION

Defence

Democracy

Secularism

KASHMIR

By

S. G. SARDESAI

COMMUNIST PARTY PUBLICATION

September 1965

INTRODUCTION

The massive infiltration of thousands of Pakistani-trained armed personnel in civilian disguise across the ceasefire line in Kashmir, followed by open aggression by the regular military forces of Pakistan across the international border between West Pakistan and the state of Jammu and Kashmir, has been rightly condemned as the second invasion of India by Pakistan since the attainment of independence by the two countries in August 1947.

This is the gravest and the most testing armed conflict imposed on independent India. From its very beginning our armed forces and the jawans have not only displayed exemplary valour in defending our borders, but have given convincing proof of their fighting efficiency and skill in beating back an aggressor equipped with superior and more powerful weapons.

As in 1947, the brave people of Kashmir are again in the front line of the battle. They have risen to defend their homes and hearths, to defend their beautiful homeland, to defend the unity, freedom and territorial integrity of India.

Our countrymen, and the working people most of all, have rallied in the cause of the motherland as never before, subordinating other interests to the call of national defence, closing their ranks irrespective of communal and other differences, offering their services for production and civil defence with discipline and dedication.

India and its people detest war and aggression. They passionately love and desire peace. With Pakistan, above all, which is not only a neighbour but was part and parcel of our country for thousands of years, and whose citizens, both Muslim and Hindu, are related to lakhs of Indians as kith and kin, India has always wanted, and still wants, relations of friendship and cooperation.

Price : 50 P.

Printed by D. P. Sinha at New Age Printing Press, Rani Jhansi Road, New Delhi, and published by him for the Communist Party of India, 4/7 Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi

In the longer run, the progress and happiness of the two countries are inconceivable excepting on the basis of such relations. The rulers of Pakistan are not only guilty of blatant and unprovoked aggression against India. They are guilty of doing incalculable damage to the future well-being of the people of both the countries.

The reckless manner in which the Ayub dictatorship is attempting to escalate its undeclared war on India, resorting even to provocative armed attacks against our borders from East Pakistan, threatens to break up Afro-Asian solidarity and is endangering the peace of the whole of South-East Asia and the world. No means, it appears, are barred in the execution of the criminal designs of the rulers of Pakistan against India.

Such, however, is the stark reality of the situation. Most grave, most unfortunate, but a situation that has got to be faced with the utmost coolness, courage and determination and on the basis of correct military and political policies.

War, whether undeclared or declared, limited or total, defensive or aggressive, is a continuation of the politics of the countries involved in it. This applies also to countries not directly involved as belligerents.

The Government of India has declared that its aim in the present military operations is to defeat Pakistan's aggression, destroy the bases from which such aggression has been committed repeatedly during the last so many years and to arrive at a ceasefire with such guarantees as will end the repetition of similar attacks on India in future. Given such conditions, India is not only prepared, but desires a reasonable settlement of all Indo-Pak differences through peaceful negotiations.

Naturally, in the present armed conflict, while concentrating national energies on the task of clearing the aggressor from Indian soil, we have also to be clear about the aims and methods of the contending political forces locked in the conflict, about how to defeat the forces of war and aggression pitted against the patriotic and democratic aims of the people of India and Kashmir and finally achieve our goal.

Through all the much-vaunted concern shown by the representatives of the Anglo-American powers in the UNO Security Council for the restoration of peace between India and Pakistan, despite their declamation of friendship both for India and Pakistan, the Anglo-American game of getting a stranglehold on Kashmir for their global, aggressive, military strategic aims and for bringing military and other pressures on India continues. Their support to Pakistan for the achievement of their aims continues. The British game of inciting Indo-Pak conflicts over Kashmir and other questions as a lever for mediating between both and serving its own selfish ends, continues.

Through their hypocritical claim of fighting for the self-determination of the people of Kashmir, the Pakistani rulers continue their aim of grabbing Kashmir both by force and by inflaming the worst communal passions in Pakistan and India. Over and above the massive military aid received by it from the Anglo-American powers as a member of the SEATO and CENTO, the *real material basis of its aggressive policies towards India*, the reactionary, communal, military dictatorship of Pakistan continues to seek Chinese support against India, which it receives for their common designs against our country.

The scope of this pamphlet is limited to the question of Kashmir and national defence. But it has to be remembered that the Anglo-American policy of utilising the Kashmir question to weaken and undermine India's economic and national freedom is part of their broader anti-Indian policy.

India was divided by the Britishers themselves by fomenting Hindu-Muslim conflict. The "problem" of Kashmir was originally their creation. Ever since independence both the Britishers and the Americans have supported all reactionary, anti-national disruptive forces in India. They conspired against and opposed the integration of Hyderabad and Goa with India. They are behind the Naga hostilities. They have consistently utilised economic aid to bring political pressures on India. Even the peril created by the Chinese attack on India in 1962 was attempted to be used by the Anglo-Americans to bring India

under military control through the so-called "air umbrella" and similar proposals.

Confronted by the grim task of defeating aggression we have also to pursue our ideal of protecting our national sovereignty and territorial integrity by strengthening its basic elements of democracy, secularism, non-alignment, the fraternal integration of India's linguistic and cultural units and the advance towards a popular economy. We have to pursue our final aim of establishing normal and peaceful relations between the two countries.

This is an effort to give a historical background of the forces involved in the present Indo-Pak conflict, the aims and methods pursued by them in the past. For obvious reasons, it is a very brief and condensed record. It is hoped that it would serve a useful purpose in working out the course we have to follow in the period ahead of us.

New Delhi
September 18, 1965

S. G. SARDESAI

PARTITION, FIRST INVASION AND POPULAR VERDICT

The first invasion of Kashmir of September-October 1947, following on the heels of the partition of the country and the formation of the independent states of India and Pakistan was inspired and organised by the former British rulers in collusion with Pakistan. Before coming to the relevant evidence, it is necessary to go into the background of this development to understand its full import and purpose.

During the British regime Kashmir, ruled by the dynasty of Maharaja Gulab Singh, was not only one of the most despotic, backward and poverty-ridden feudal states in India. What is more important, the paramount British power always kept it under an iron grip because of its contiguity with Central Asia against which British imperialism always harboured expansionist designs. After the Russian revolution and the formation of the USSR, Kashmir assumed still greater strategic importance in imperialist eyes.

As early as 1890, the Government of India directed the "ruler" of Kashmir "not to take any steps of importance without consulting the (British) Resident and to follow his advice whenever it may be offered."

After the First World War, as the Russian Socialist Revolution spread over Central Asia, British military missions were established in Kashmir and carried on flagrant subversive activities in the Central Asian Republics. Gilgit was "acquired" from the Maharaja of Kashmir under a sixty-year lease and used for the construction of air-fields and a wireless station.

From the end of the Second World War, the USA also started taking a keen interest in Kashmir. Papers like the *New York Times* and the *New York Herald Tribune* started writing about the strategic importance of the state because of its proximity

to the Soviet Union and its new industrial centres. David Lilienthal, one-time Chairman of the US Atomic Energy Commission, wrote about it. American newspaper correspondents in India sent despatches on the US interest in Kashmir. The *New York Times* published a map captioned "The West's programme for containment and the gap". Kashmir was shown as one of the "gaps". Top American military experts were sent to the region for "defence" surveys. British military chiefs like Montgomery, Mountbatten and Pierse also visited Kashmir to discuss "the future British defence of North India." The Royal Air Force brought in bombers and planes and carried out air-maneuvres in Kashmir.

The Anglo-Americans, however, were counting without their host. And that host was the volcanic mass upsurge for freedom unleashed by the war in India and Kashmir as over the whole of Asia.

The Quit Kashmir movement led by the National Conference with its inspiring popular programme of New Kashmir spread like a wildfire in the state in 1946. Linked with the freedom movement in India by the closest bonds, it demanded the complete abolition of feudal despotic rule in the state, the abolition of landlordism without compensation, land to the tiller, and a genuinely popular government.

Alarmed at the tidal sweep and power of the movement, Kak, notorious stooge of the British Political Department and the Prime Minister of the state, unleashed unbridled repression against it. The state was handed over to the army which gave a bloodbath to the people with all the frightful and humiliating accompaniments of Martial Law.

Even this terror, it must be noted, was planned and executed by British officers and Kak together. The plans were prepared by the British Commandant of the Kashmir State Army, Brigadier Scott, Inspector-General Powell and Kak, who openly boasted that "we have been preparing them for eleven months." Kak's paper, the *Kashmir Times*, wrote of "moving in British troops from Rawalpindi and Sialkot in the name of India's

defence." "India's" defence, indeed! The only thing Kak was defending was his British masters and their stooge, the autocratic ruler of Kashmir, from the popular upsurge for freedom. And, of course, he was executing the British behest of giving them full military power in the "strategic" state of Kashmir.

Events moved in rapid succession. Confronted with the irresistible national upsurge, the British were preparing to divide the country and transfer power to the Congress and the Muslim League in India and the proposed state of Pakistan respectively. What were their plans for the future status of Kashmir when partition and the transfer of power to India and Pakistan would become a reality?

The British position was that after partition the rulers of the Indian states would be free either to accede to India or Pakistan or to remain "independent".

For Kashmir, of course, the status proposed by the British was "independence". Lord Mountbatten visited Kashmir in June 1947 and had long talks with the Maharaja and Kak. Immediately a campaign was launched by Kak, the Kashmir Muslim Conference and the Jammu Rajya Sabha demanding "independence" for Kashmir from the prospective states of India and Pakistan. Telegrams were showered on the Viceroy. Both the above-mentioned organisations, be it noted, had opposed the Quit Kashmir movement and supported princely rule. Both represented feudal reaction in Kashmir. In addition, one represented Muslim communalism and the other Hindu communalism.

The British plot of "independent" Kashmir stands revealed in a later letter addressed by the Maharaja to Lord Mountbatten when the former finally decided on accession to India. Wrote the Maharaja in his letter dated October 26, 1947:

"As Your Excellency is aware, the state of Jammu and Kashmir has not acceded to either the Dominion of India or Pakistan. Geographically my state is contiguous to both. . . . Besides it has a common boundary with the Soviet Republic and China. . . . In international relations the Dominions of India and

Pakistan cannot ignore this fact. . . . I wanted to take time to decide whether it is not in the best interest of both Dominions and my state to stand independent."

The only "independence" of which this tool of the British could speak of was unfettered freedom for the British power to treat the whole state as an occupied territory and prison; to utilise it for keeping India and Pakistan eternally at loggerheads; and, of course, use it as an imperialist strategic military base. The Maharaja was incapable of talking about "independence" except on British instigation.

While pressurising the Maharaja to declare "independence", the shrewd and calculating British rulers were simultaneously hatching another and far more diabolical plot. They were conscious of the immense strength of the National Conference, its close ties with the Indian National Congress which was in sympathy with the popular movement in Kashmir, as also its opposition to the Muslim League which was supporting the Maharaja against the popular movement. In this situation, there was every likelihood that the Kashmir ruler would be finally compelled to accede to India and the dream of "independent" Kashmir would die a miserable death.

It was to forestall precisely such a development that the fiendish mass invasion of Kashmir by certain North West Frontier tribesmen, the Masoods, Afridis, etc. was prepared for by the British in September 1947 and unleashed in October 1947. The newly-formed Pakistan government, first supplied the tribal raiders with arms and later, in December 1947, sent its regular troops into Kashmir to support them.

All this has now been proved to the hilt by undeniable evidence subsequently brought to light and accepted by Pakistan itself and also recorded by the UN Commission on India and Pakistan in 1948.

The recruitment of the tribals was started by Sir George Cunningham, Governor of the N.W. Frontier Province, and the well-known British agent, Khan Bahadur Kuli Khan. Among the recruiting and training officers was Colonel Ingall, British

Commandant of the Pakistani Military Academy. The same Brigadier Scott who in 1946 dealt with the Quit Kashmir movement with fire and sword, also assisted in the recruitment.

Immediately following the orgy of mass pillage, arson, murder and even rape let loose by the tribal hordes in Kashmir, Duke, Deputy Commissioner of the UK in Peshawar, met the raiders, now styling themselves as the "Azad Kashmir" Army and freely fraternised with them. Other British officers called them "liberators".

Probably the most self-confessed proof of the British hand behind the barbaric attack on Kashmir was the letter of Sir George Cunningham to General Sir Rob Lockhart, one of the Army Chiefs in India, written in August 1947, informing him about the recruitment of the tribals though, of course, he took the precaution of saying in the same letter that he doubted if he could stop it. Sir Rob Lockhart did not show the letter to the Indian Cabinet when he received it but much later, which speaks volumes for his own complicity in the plot. Still later, he destroyed it. Such conclusively damaging evidence could naturally not be preserved.

It is extremely significant that the American Charge d'Affairs in Pakistan, Lewis, also visited the N.W. Frontier Province about this time. An ex-American military officer, Haig, personally led a group of tribal raiders and was given the rank of a Brigadier in the "Azad Kashmir" Army. Anglo-American correspondents of the *New York Herald Tribune*, the *Daily Mail*, the *Daily Telegraph* and *Reuters*, all glorified the raiders as "liberators" in their despatches.

As the raiding hordes swept through the Valley and threatened Srinagar itself, the rotten, decrepit government of the Maharaja reached the stage of utter collapse. The Maharaja himself fled to Jammu. It was the people led by the National Conference who organised a popular militia and held the raiders at bay. The administration of the city was *de facto* taken over by the National Conference.

When Srinagar itself was in peril, Sheikh Abdullah and the

National Conference leaders appealed to the Indian government for military support.

It is on record that Mountbatten and the British Service Chiefs of the Indian Army opposed the sending of Indian troops to Kashmir on the specious plea that Indian troops could not be sent to an "independent" neutral state which had not acceded to India.

The Indian Cabinet had to overrule the objection and insisted on the despatch of troops.

Actually, frightened by the tribal invasion and also by the *de facto* take over of the administration by the National Conference, the Maharaja acceded to India on October 26, 1947, and the first Indian troops were flown to Srinagar on the 27th of October.

Sheikh Abdullah and the National Conference leadership fully supported the accession and informed the Government of India accordingly.

The situation still continued precarious during the next two weeks. It was in the second week of November that the Indian army and the popular militia could go on the offensive and beat back the invaders. The story of the ceasefire and how it came belongs to the subsequent period and will be narrated later.

As soon as Mountbatten realised that the capture of Srinagar by the raiders was impossible, he pressed Nehru to go and meet Jinnah, but the proposal was not acceptable to the Indian Cabinet. Thereon, Mountbatten himself dashed off to Lahore and interviewed Jinnah.

What transpired in this interview has been recorded by no less an authority than Alan Campbell Johnson, Mountbatten's Press Attache, in his now famous memoirs *Mission with Mountbatten*. This is what the memoirs say:

"Mountbatten advised Jinnah of the strength of the Indian forces in Srinagar and told him that *he considered the prospect of the tribesmen entering Srinagar was now remote...* On enquiry, Mountbatten found that Jinnah's attitude to a plebis-

cite was conditioned by his belief that the combination of Indian troops in occupation and Sheikh Abdullah's power meant that the average Muslim would be far too frightened to vote for Pakistan. Mountbatten proposed a plebiscite under UNO auspices." (emphasis added)

Nothing can expose the villainous capacity of British rulers to discover and exploit changing stratagems according to changing situations and all for achieving their basic objective of divide and rule, as this interview.

First pressurise the Maharaja to declare the "independence" of Kashmir; failing that, organise a mass invasion and butchery to seize Kashmir by brute force; and failing that, too, bring in a plebiscite under UNO i.e. Anglo-American auspices—and all for retaining their own hold over Kashmir, such was the diabolically skilful game played by the British during the decisive period of the struggle of the people of India and Kashmir for freedom and unity.

And it is precisely the plot of a "plebiscite under UNO auspices" backed, of course, by armed force, that is dogging us to this day, 18 years after independence.

However, the proved and undeniable facts of this crucial period are no less relevant today than in 1947, and must be briefly stated. They were:

1. The tribal invasion of Kashmir of 1947 was organised by the British and supported by Pakistan.
2. Since no one has ever claimed or could that the raiders were Kashmiris, the question of their being "liberators" of Kashmir could not arise.
3. This is proved still further by the fact that it was the people of Kashmir themselves who fought back the incendiary and plundering raiders. "Liberators" are welcomed, not fought back.
4. The fraudulent plea that the raiders went to Kashmir to free their co-religionists, the Muslims, from the despotism of the alien Hindu Maharaja was also blown up by life itself. The despotic rule of the Hindu Maharaja was abolished by the

democratic, anti-feudal movement of the people of Kashmir themselves. And precisely because of their profoundly secular, democratic and national convictions, they also defeated the raiders despite both being Muslim, because they knew them to be British mercenaries who had invaded Kashmir to reforge the chains of slavery which they had broken. The defeat of the raiders by the people of Kashmir is the most glowing chapter in the history of the struggle for the secular democratic unity of India.

5. Lastly, it was the unquestioned leadership of the Kashmiri people's heroic struggle against feudal despotism and imperialist domination, Sheikh Abdullah and others, as also their representative organisation, the Kashmir National Conference, that decided on accession to India. No better exercise of the right of self-determination can be asked or wished for by anyone having the remotest regard for a people's democratic verdict on the question.

INDIA GOES TO THE UNO

Back from Lahore, Mountbatten started probing the Indian Cabinet, i.e. the Congress leadership, for the acceptance of his new line—ceasefire and a plebiscite under UNO auspices.

Now that Kashmir had constitutionally acceded to India under an Act of the British Parliament, which had created the Dominions of India and Pakistan, Mountbatten could no longer object to the use of Indian troops in Kashmir.

His new argument (again noted by Campbell Johnson) was that if the Indian army advanced beyond Uri for driving out the raiders from the whole of Kashmir and thus approached the border of Pakistan, it would touch off open war between the two countries which must be avoided at all costs since both were Dominions in the British Commonwealth.

Nothing was easier for the Indian army at this time than to

clear off the raiders from Kashmir since our army was fully on the offensive and the raiders on the run.

And yet, about December 1947, the advance of the Indian army was halted, leading to an unwritten ceasefire in practice, and the raiders remained in occupation of much the same part of Kashmir as they occupy down to this day. Why this happened is a mysterious and intriguing question which has never been cleared up till now. But obviously, with his known views, advice and influence, the hand of Mountbatten must be suspected behind the stopping of the further advance of an army whose only crime was that it was driving out an aggressor from the soil of the country to which it belonged. We must not forget that there were plenty of British officers, high and low, in the Indian army at that time.

Simultaneously, Mountbatten started working on the Congress leaders to accept his proposal for a plebiscite in Kashmir under UNO auspices.

Now the Kashmir people's struggle during its grim struggle against the Maharaja had itself given the slogan of convening a Constituent Assembly after the abolition of autocratic princely rule. It was a perfectly democratic slogan. Later, such a Constituent Assembly was actually elected on the basis of adult franchise in 1951. It reconfirmed the accession of Kashmir to India which had been juridically signed and sealed by the Maharaja with the full support of the National Conference in 1947 as stated earlier. It also adopted a Constitution for Kashmir which was different from the Constitution of the Indian Union only in this that it provided for the abolition of landlordism without compensation and for the abolition of princely rule which had not then been accomplished in the other princely states that had acceded to India.

This testified to the fact that the Kashmiri people's movement, while standing solidly for unity and integration with India was more democratic and radical than the freedom movement in the rest of the country. The Constituent Assembly of the valiant people of Kashmir was an expression of their urge

for uniting the whole of India on the basis of the most advanced democracy possible in the given situation, both in the sphere of popular political rights and the nation's economy. It did not have the faintest odour of any non-popular, external control or of separatism from the rest of the country.

Naturally, the plebiscite under UNO auspices proposed by Mountbatten had nothing in common with such a Constituent Assembly. In fact, the clear implications of the concept of such a plebiscite were the diametrical opposite of the people's concept of the Constituent Assembly.

Firstly, the Mountbatten proposal was made at the point of the bayonet, in the background of the British sponsored tribal invasion of Kashmir. This can never be the context in which a true plebiscite is organised since it militates against the very basic concept of a free popular verdict.

Secondly, implicit in the Mountbatten proposal was the suggestion that the Kashmiri people, just because they were Muslim, would, or at least, may prefer joining Pakistan. It was a slander which the people of Kashmir had repudiated at the cost of the blood of thousands of their martyrs.

Thirdly, a plebiscite under UNO auspices would obviously violate India's national independence and sovereignty by permitting a purely internal question being decided under foreign auspices.

Lastly, and what was most important, with the clear Anglo-American domination over the UNO, the Mountbatten proposal was nothing but a cunning device and cover to re-establish the imperialist hold over Kashmir which the Britishers had as good as lost despite all their intrigues of creating an "independent" Kashmir and despite the massive tribal invasion organised by them.

The Indian leaders were shrewd and firm enough to insist that the question of the plebiscite could not be taken up until the raiders had been made to withdraw from Indian soil.

But it is also a tragedy, one for which we are paying till this day, that they did accept the proposal of a plebiscite under

UNO auspices. In a speech in November, Pandit Nehru declared publicly: "We are prepared, when peace and law and order have been established, to have a referendum held under international auspices like the United Nations."

The Government of India finally referred the Kashmir issue to the UN Security Council on December 31, 1947.

It must be noted that India's reference of the issue to the Security Council was exclusively on the question of the tribal invasion and its vacation. Pakistan was charged with allowing the raiders transit across its territory, allowing them to use Pakistani territory as a base of operations and also supplying them with military equipment and training.

Gopaldaswamy Iyengar, India's representative in the UNO, said in his opening speech: "We have referred to the Council a simple and straightforward issue. The withdrawal and expulsion of the raiders from the soil of Kashmir and immediate stoppage of the fight are the *first and only* tasks to which we have to address ourselves."

The position of the Pakistani representative, Zafrullah Khan, at the moment when the issue was first introduced in the UNO was extremely significant and illuminating.

Jinnah, the Governor-General of Pakistan, was an arch-constitutionalist for whom British constitutional law was supreme. As such, his spokesman in the Security Council could not and in fact, *did not*, question the legal validity of the accession of the state of Jammu and Kashmir to India. He made vague references to the accession having been brought about by duress, fraud, etc. and left the issue at that. By duress, of course, was meant the pressure of the people's freedom movement led by the National Conference. He did not question India's position that the raiders had no legal right to be in Kashmir (i.e. Indian territory), and that their being within Indian territory was an act of aggression.

In fact, further. Pakistan's representative repudiated the charge that Pakistan was giving any help to the raiders and claimed that it was actually trying to discourage them. He

quoted verbatim from a letter dated December 30, 1947 written by the Prime Minister of Pakistan to India's Prime Minister in reply to an earlier letter of the latter requesting Pakistan not to give aid or assistance to the raiders. Its text ran as under:

"As regards the charges of aid and assistance to the invaders by the Pakistan Government, we emphatically repudiate them. On the contrary, the Pakistan Government have continued to do all in their power to discourage the tribal movements by all means short of war."

What a categorical statement by the first Prime Minister of Pakistan, sanctioned by the Founder of Pakistan, in whose name the Ayub dictatorship now calls India's presence in Kashmir as "annexation and occupation" and even claims the right of "liberating" Kashmir by a full-fledged armed invasion!

It should be noted, in passing, that not only raiders trained and equipped by Pakistan but even regular units of the Pakistani army were in Kashmir at the time Zafrullah Khan made the foregoing brazenly false statement in the Security Council. Pakistan admitted this in the middle of 1948 when the UNCIP visited India and Pakistan, including the "Azad Kashmir" area, when it was impossible to deny facts any longer.

The position taken by the Pakistani representative was, of course, dishonest. But since that was his formal position and since India and Pakistan were the only two countries involved, there was nothing to prevent the Security Council from immediately proceeding to the task of forging sanctions for the vacation of aggression in accordance with the UN Charter.

Who was it then, that stampeded the Security Council in brushing away the straight and simple question of aggression and its vacation and substituting it by the question of a free plebiscite as though India had committed a heinous crime in being in Kashmir for which it had to atone by giving the "oppressed" people of Kashmir the freedom to exercise the right of either joining Pakistan or India or remaining independent?

The reply to this question is as clear as daylight. Here is what Warren Austin, the US representative in the Security Council, said after India and Pakistan had stated their case:

"How are you going to ask the tribesmen to retire? Only when they are satisfied that there will be a fair plebiscite assured through an interim government can you have a peaceful settlement."

On the heels of Austin followed Noel Baker, the representative of Britain. He said:

"The main thing is the plebiscite itself. The plebiscite is a vital part of the whole settlement. This plebiscite must inspire confidence in everybody, including those fighting. I, therefore, arrive at the conclusion as other members that impartial interim administration arrangements must be made."

With this mandate given, the US-British underlings in the Security Council naturally chimed in with the same tune.

It was left to the Soviet representative, Andrei Gromyko to raise his voice against this shocking Anglo-American bullying and blackmail. He said,

"This gesture would not add anything to what has already been done. We need a resolution which will deal with the substance of the issue."

But the brute majority of the Anglo-American powers and their henchmen prevailed. Against all protests by Iyengar and the opposition of the Soviet representative, the Security Council adopted its first resolution on the Kashmir question hypocritically asking "India and Pakistan to take immediately all measures in their power to improve the situation and refrain from taking any measures which might worsen the situation."

The very first resolution of the Security Council thus equated the aggressor and the victim of aggression, politically and morally, thereby opening the door for its subsequent mischievous intervention in the so-called Indo-Pak dispute over Kashmir.

Since India was virulently opposed to the injection of the proposal for a UNO plebiscite in the problem it had posed

before the Security Council, the Anglo-Americans watered it down through a resolution which still retained the essence of it. The resolution was proposed by the representative of China and combined with an apparently innocuous proposal for the appointment of a UN Commission on India and Pakistan to study the dispute and explore the possibilities of settling it through mediation. The proposal was adopted by the Security Council wherewith began the operative intervention of the UNO in the Kashmir question.

ANGLO-AMERICAN INTERVENTION IN UNO GARB

The debate and decisions of the Security Council created a violent reaction in India. The Indian press sharply attacked the entire spirit of the decisions which practically made the aggressor—the aggrieved party, and the victim of aggression—the guilty one. Nehru charged the Anglo-American powers with “refusal to face the straight issue and considering it not on its merits but subordinate to the use of power politics.”

But such was the faith of the national leaders on the Anglo-Americans that the Government of India did not withdraw the Kashmir question from the UNO nor even take the categorical position that it would accept no commission, investigation, mediation, conciliation, plans, formulas, good offices and the like from the UNO excepting on the exclusive question of the expulsion of the proved aggressor from the soil of Kashmir. Again, *Mission with Mountbatten* records how Mountbatten “with his overwhelming persistence and flair for argument in detail” finally prevailed on the Indian leaders to discuss matters coolly and specifically with the UNCIP.

After some correspondence with the Secretary-General of the UNO, the Government of India wrote to him that it would be glad to confer with the Commission when it arrived at

Delhi and so the Commission arrived in India in the middle of 1948.

Who were the members of the United Nations Commission? They were the USA, Belgium, Colombia, Argentina and Czechoslovakia, the last two being nominated by Pakistan and India respectively. Throughout the functioning of the UNCIP, Czechoslovakia alone stood by India and a genuine solution of the Indo-Pak conflict. All the rest invariably toed the line put across by the US member of the Commission.

On arrival in India, the Commission realised the intensity of the opposition to any consideration of the proposal for a plebiscite until the question of the invaders was tackled.

Hence it started its activities cautiously by showing concern for the achievement of a ceasefire agreed to by both the sides. Even this was not easy, for, though the Indian army had *de facto* stopped advancing beyond its positions in December 1947 barring some moves in 1948, the government was conscious that the formal acceptance of a ceasefire line would mean an indefinite postponement of the withdrawal of Pakistani troops (regular and irregular, i.e. the “Azad Kashmir” Army) from Kashmir. However, negotiations for a ceasefire were conducted and a ceasefire line, accepted by India and Pakistan, finally came into effect from January 1, 1949.

Simultaneously, the Commission started protracted negotiations with India and Pakistan on India’s demand for the vacation of aggression, and the proposal for a “free plebiscite” placed before the Security Council and by now supported with great gusto by Pakistan.

The Commission’s essential trick was to link the two issues so as to make India accept the plebiscite.

A formula was at last agreed to and put in the form of the UNCIP resolution of August 13, 1948, which was accepted by both India and Pakistan.

The key clauses of the resolution provided that (a) Pakistan was first to withdraw its troops and secure the withdrawal of the invading tribesmen from Kashmir; (b) after such with-

drawal, India was to withdraw the bulk of its troops from Kashmir; (c) UN military observers were to be introduced into Kashmir for supervision; and (d) the future of Jammu and Kashmir was to be determined in accordance with the will of the people for which fair and equitable conditions would be created by the two governments in consultation with the UNCIP.

It is not possible and not necessary to go through the labyrinth of negotiations, clarifications, proposals and counter-proposals that ensued India's acceptance of this resolution and dragged on for several years. Its one and only saving grace—undoubtedly vitally important—was that India's commitment to a plebiscite in Kashmir and of the creation of "fair and equitable" conditions for it in consultation with the UNCIP (meaning obviously a plebiscite under some or the other form of Anglo-American domination), was *conditional* on Pakistan's prior withdrawal of its forces and the tribal raiders from Kashmir.

Pakistan never carried out its commitment and in fact, after joining the SEATO, tremendously increased its armed strength all round and also in Kashmir. Hence, the question of India carrying out its obligation to hold a plebiscite never arose. Dominantly for this reason, besides others, finally, in 1962, India declared that it was no longer bound to hold a plebiscite in Kashmir.

This does not mean, however, that the resolution did not lead to grave damage.

In the course of negotiations and talks pertaining to the clarification, concretisation, elaboration and so on of the 13th August resolution, India was dragged into discussions on the phased evacuation of Pakistani and Indian troops from Kashmir which implied that both Indian and Pakistani troops were equally entitled or not entitled to be in Kashmir. This gave a moral basis for the proposal to import foreign troops into Kashmir for policing purposes *pari passu* with the phased evacuation.

In the discussion on the creation of "fair and equitable" conditions for the plebiscite, the UNCIP put forward proposals which amounted to reducing the Kashmir government to a nonentity.

Luckily for India, the UNCIP in its effort to inveigle both India and Pakistan into mutual conflict, gave patently contradictory assurances to both which were naturally exposed in due course. Even the *London Times* commented, "The Commission tried to be all things to all men, with the result that it lost face and got nowhere."

India's faith in the UNO, in reality, its faith in Anglo-American representatives, its eagerness to seek their good offices and mediation, also brought a series of UN representatives to India under various pretexts, each one of whom attempted to carry out the Anglo-American game of getting a hold over Kashmir through one formula or another.

Admiral Nimitz of the US Navy was appointed Plebiscite Administrator and in the name of overcoming the hurdles in the way of holding the plebiscite was also authorised to arbitrate on truce terms between India and Pakistan. Both Attlee and Truman pressed India to accept such arbitration.

A proposal was brought forth in the Commonwealth Conference at the instance of Truman to send a Commonwealth Peace Force to Kashmir.

The Australian jurist, Sir Owen Dixon, known to be a favourite of the US State Department, was sent as a representative and canvassed for the tri-partition of Jammu and Kashmir, with the plebiscite limited to the Valley of Kashmir.

Yet another representative, Dr. Frank Graham, proposed raising the number of UN observers to several thousands and equipping them with military weapons in the name of the demilitarisation of Kashmir.

At one stage, the Anglo-American powers threatened to stop petrol supplies to India for not accepting their proposals.

Dr. Chyle, the Czechoslovak representative in the UNCIP, consistently opposed all these pressures and manoeuvres and in

his various reports and minutes pointed out how all of them had one and the same purpose, viz. the Anglo-American drive for getting a hold over Kashmir.

In the UNO, the Soviet representative Y. Malik, reiterating that the Soviet Union considered the whole of the state of Jammu and Kashmir as an integral part of India, sternly warned the Anglo-American powers against intriguing in Kashmir. He stated:

“These plans, as regards Kashmir, aim to achieve the bringing of American-British troops into the territory of Kashmir and to convert it into an American-British colony and a military-strategic strong point.”

It is true that the various Anglo-American plans did not succeed in dragging India into the plebiscite net but because of India not having taken categorical positions, they often compromised India's positions during negotiations thereby emboldening their sponsors to bring diverse pressures on India and also encouraging Pakistan to take more and more truculent and offensive positions.

The worst harm done by India's unending search for mediation through the UNO was that in the international forum, the real and the only question of vacation of aggression was replaced by the so-called question of ascertaining the free will of the people of Kashmir under “fair and equitable” conditions. In due course, any number of non-aligned countries friendly to India also developed the deep impression that the substantial issue was one of self-determination for Kashmir.

Equal harm and greater mischief was done by the UN military observers in Kashmir, whom India had to accept in terms of the 13th August resolution. A few of the facts must be cited for illustration.

Immediately after the ceasefire agreement came into operation on January 1, 1949, the military observers started pouring into Kashmir. Very soon they were over a hundred, half of them from the USA and most others from countries in

Western Europe or such as Australia and Canada. The ranks of the observers ranged from sergeants to generals.

The first thing the military observers' group did on reaching Kashmir was to conduct a thorough military survey of the whole of Kashmir which was not only totally unnecessary but beyond the military observers' terms of reference which were limited to supervising the implementation of the ceasefire agreement. The key men in charge of the military survey were two high American and British officers. Since 1950, Major-General Nimmo of Australia has been the Chief Military Observer. One can easily estimate his sense of duty and impartiality from his recent utterance that he had no authority or responsibility to prevent armed men crossing the ceasefire line into India if they came in civilian clothes.

Any number of Anglo-American military experts and high officials, besides the official observers, have been permitted to visit the nooks and corners of Kashmir for military observation. Their photographers have also been free to go anywhere and take any photographs they wanted, including strategic positions, bridges and military installations. Anglo-American newspaper correspondents are always prowling on the scene.

Members of the military observers' group in their routine duty are rotated from one side of the ceasefire line to the other and they have wireless sets, jeeps and even planes at their disposal. The dangerous military implications of this system for Indian defence must be noted, for India is a non-aligned country, while Pakistan is in the SEATO and CENTO. Since the overwhelming majority of the observers come from countries of the NATO, SEATO and CENTO blocs, their being fully acquainted with both sides of the ceasefire line has undeniable military advantages for Pakistan and risks for India.

The observers have been repeatedly found distributing dollars and money on a large scale to all sorts of persons obviously for the purpose of securing confidential information, and buying up people for spying. Whenever the UNCIP representatives

have put across their various nefarious proposals to India, the military observers' group has organised whisper campaigns and canvassing in Kashmir for those proposals. Christian Missions in Kashmir have helped the observers in all these activities.

Particularly after the arrest of Sheikh Abdullah in 1953, many members of the military observers' group made such unconcealed attempts to provoke the people to commit acts of violence that the Kashmir government had to threaten them with the withdrawal of their diplomatic immunity. Orders had to be passed preventing military observers' jeeps from going out of certain strictly limited areas.

Smuggling for private profit, of course, is a regular occupation of the observers, since they can any time cross over from one side of the ceasefire line to the other and back. But that, after all, is not their worst crime.

Behind all the sweet talks, cajoling, negotiations, mediation, etc. that UNO representatives carry on with India, though there too the iron fist under the velvet glove is disclosed when necessary, it is the activities of the military observers' group in Kashmir that reveal the deeper meaning and hideous face of UNO intervention in all its nakedness. Fraud, duplicity, bribery, spying, treachery, anything and everything for grabbing Kashmir from India and making a gift of it to USA and Britain directly or via Pakistan, that is the plain meaning of UNO intervention.

BACK AGAIN FROM DIPLOMACY TO ARMED FORCE

By 1951-52 both the Pakistani rulers and their imperialist masters came to realise that diplomatic pressures and manoeuvres, ruses and cajoling, backed by occasional political blackmail and threats could not succeed in achieving their objective of detaching Kashmir from India and getting a *de facto* or *de jure* hold over it.

With all their eagerness for negotiations and mediation, with all their readiness to discuss various schemes for the withdrawal of the bulk of Indian armed forces from Kashmir, despite the consideration given by Indian representatives to the question of creating "fair and equitable" conditions for the holding of a plebiscite in Kashmir, Nehru and the Government of India could not be made to budge from their basic position that the invaders, (tribal, "Azad Kashmir" units or the regular armed forces of Pakistan) had to evacuate occupied Kashmir before any plebiscite was actually organised. And no amount of sweet mediation and bludgeoning was going to succeed in overcoming this hurdle.

So the imperialist and Pakistani line of thinking again began to take a turn towards force as the instrument for bringing India to "a reasonable" state of mind for which they began to work gradually.

A number of other factors also had begun to come on the scene and developed further with the passage of time, leading imperialism and the ruling circles in Pakistan to the same conclusion. It is necessary to grasp them properly.

Confronted by the sweeping and irresistible colonial liberationist upsurge in Asia and Africa after the Second World War, the American imperialists with the junior partnership of Great Britain, brought the cold-war to both the continents in the name of containing and rolling back the tide of communist "aggression", strengthening the Afro-Asian "free" nations against "communist subversion" and so on. The Americans, by far the more powerful of the two, both economically and militarily, led the crusade against colonial liberation.

Hundreds, and later thousands of millions of dollars started being poured into Afro-Asian countries, part of the investment in the name of economic aid, which, too, had political strings, but by far the biggest part, for "military aid". The only purpose of this so-called military aid was to establish and rope in reactionary military dictatorial regimes in the net of American and British military pacts for encircling the socialist countries,

for crushing the Afro-Asian liberation struggles, and also for suppressing democratic movements within each country which received military aid.

It was thus that separate Anglo-American military alliances with various countries from Turkey to Korea such as the American-Pak military agreement of 1954 were forged. Above all, it was thus that the gigantic military machines called the Baghdad and SEATO pacts were created. When the Baghdad Pact collapsed due to the revolution in Iraq, it was reorganised under the new title of CENTO.

Meanwhile, what was happening inside Pakistan? With an extremely weak economy completely dominated by landlords both in the west and the east and in addition, by feudal chieftains in the west, with the ruling Muslim League interested in nothing but preaching hatred of India and the Hindus, with an administration utterly bureaucratic and callous towards the most elementary interests of the people, a profound economic and political crisis began to grow in the country almost on the heels of the birth of the new state.

The situation worsened still further within a few years. While the League leadership did nothing even to arrest the growing deterioration in the economic conditions of the people or to introduce a democratic form of government which would give some scope to the people to ventilate their discontent, the League organisation became utterly corrupt and honeycombed with careerists and self-seekers. The Muslim League government could not hold on even as a reactionary, communal government. It became so faction-ridden and discredited that even in the fake elections held here and there, it was defeated by splinter elements which had broken away and all sorts of other combinations.

Identically the same situation, however, led not only to intense popular discontent but to a remarkable growth of organised popular forces.

Naturally enough, this happened first in East Pakistan. With all its religious affinity with West Pakistan, the Muslim population of East Pakistan resented very strongly what was a naked

reality, viz. being governed by a bureaucracy and army drawn almost completely from West Pakistan. This also meant that the educated youth of East Pakistan could not get good jobs in the services. It became common talk among East Pakistan Muslims that they were a colony of West Pakistan.

No less and even more significant was the fact of the common bond and interest of East Pakistan Muslims and Hindus as against the domination of West Pakistan.

Both had a common language, Bengali, of which they were tremendously proud. Administration in Urdu was an alien imposition on both. Common language means common culture despite the wall of religion. Both were taxed heavily while the Central Budget expenditure was mainly on West Pakistan. East Pakistani jute earned foreign exchange which was expended on West Pakistan.

Apart from the bureaucratic bosses of the administration being alien, politically and constitutionally also Pakistan was such a highly centralised state that provincial autonomy became a popular demand of East Pakistan Hindus and Muslims alike. Despite its numerical majority in Pakistan as a whole, the East Pakistan population had the same representation in the Pakistan National Assembly which caused intense resentment despite the fact that the National Assembly was a fake and a rubber stamp for the policies and decisions of the rulers. Strong resentment also grew against the rulers' growing tie-up with the Americans, economic, political and military, from which East Pakistan had nothing to gain and everything to lose.

East Bengal had a very powerful kisan movement which continued after partition despite heavy repression against the kisan sabha and the Communist Party.

It was all these factors and the resultant discontent that led to the electoral victory of the Awami League of East Pakistan (whose membership was open both to Muslims and Hindus) led by Maulana Bhashani in 1964. The kisans and the kisan sabha, students and their organisations, workers, intellectuals, various democratic and progressive elements, all supported the Awami

League whose platform encompassed democratic and progressive demands on the issues mentioned above. Ghulam Mohammed, the Prime Minister of Pakistan, intervened after the elections and dissolved the State Assembly.

Similar, though not as powerful, developments took place in West Pakistan also in which the domination of West Punjab was strongly resented by the Pakhtoons in the North-West Frontier Province, the Baluchis and so on. In the North-West Frontier Province, in particular, Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, the great leader of the Red Shirt movement against British rule wielded tremendous influence. In 1956, six political parties of West Pakistan combined to form a single National Party and adopted a progressive democratic platform.

Meanwhile, the Bhashani leadership of the Awami League had broken with Suhrawardy and formed the National Awami Party which together with the Ganatantri Dal of East Pakistan agreed to merge with the newly formed National Party of West Pakistan.

It is in this entire context that the emergence and growth of the military dictatorial tendency in Pakistan from 1950-51 onwards which culminated in the establishment of a total military dictatorship under Ayub Khan in 1958, has to be understood. It was expressed in the growing usurpation of power by Iskandar Mirza, but since he did not prove "strong enough" for the imperialists and feudal-bureaucratic reaction in Pakistan, he was replaced by Ayub, the "strong man", in 1958.

Immediately after the success of Ayub's coup the Pakistani Constitution was abrogated, legislatures were dissolved, all political parties were disbanded, the recognised leaders of the growing democratic opposition like Khan Abdul Ghaffar Khan, Maulana Bhashani, Abdus Samad Khan and G. M. Syed were arrested, and open military rule established.

The utter fraud of the basic democracy introduced by the Ayub regime was thoroughly exposed by the ghastly campaign of terror and bloodshed by means of which the opposition was

crushed in the recent elections in Pakistan. It is too fresh an experience to need description.

Thus it was both internal and external factors that led to the emergence of the Ayub military dictatorship in Pakistan. Violent suppression of the growing democratic forces within Pakistan as the internal policy, and growing aggressive actions against India for grabbing Kashmir as the foreign policy, these were its two pillars, as also its objectives.

Vast military aid from the USA and Britain was the obvious and indispensable means for the attainment of both the objectives which, of course, the Anglo-Americans placed at the disposal of President Ayub with the greatest willingness since it served their global aims of the military encirclement of socialist countries and the suppression of freedom movements in Asia and Africa.

We, in India, have to realise that the two aims of imperialism are inseparable and in vital conflict with our own national interests. The same military air base at Peshawar which was used for sending U-2 planes over the Soviet Union by the USA has also been used by Ayub to bomb our jawans and the civilian population. One of the vital purposes of the Pak-USA military pact has been to bring all kinds of military pressures on India for compelling us to give up non-alignment and accept a status of economic and political dependence on the West.

The internal and foreign policies of the Ayub military dictatorship are inseparably interconnected.

The suppression of democracy in Pakistan and the growing economic misery of the people demand a diversion of their discontent to emotionally agitational issues like the acquisition of Kashmir. This is also demanded by the fact that a military dictatorship cannot survive for long without military successes which are its only means of retaining a hold on the people.

We need refer only to some of the outstanding features of

Indo-Pak relations and how they have developed during the last decade and more to illustrate what has been stated above.

Firstly, the bellicosity and aggressive actions of Pakistan against India culminating in the present massive aggression have grown side by side with and in the measure in which it has received more and more military aid from the USA and Great Britain through the USA-Pakistan military agreement of 1953 and through Pakistan's membership of the CENTO and SEATO.

From 1953 onwards US military aid to Pakistan steadily increased. In recent years it has been estimated at Rs. 650 crores a year. Not all military equipment supplied through the SEATO and CENTO is accounted for by this figure. Apart from other arms, it includes the construction of military air-fields with the most modern radar equipment (two of them in Gilgit and Chitral) and the now famous Patton tanks and the F-104 fighter planes and F-86 sabre jets.

The Pakistani military budget has increased by over 300 crores of rupees a year during the last six years.

Not only has the strength of the Pakistani army been increased. The "Azad Kashmir" forces have increased manifold apart from receiving regular training and modern equipment.

Pari Passu with the military potential of Pakistan have grown increasing threats to settle the Kashmir "dispute" by force.

Mumtaz Daultana, then Chief Minister of West Pakistan, and Pir Ilahi Baksh, Chief Minister of Sindh, said in 1955: "We should not talk with India. We should prepare for the final settlement. The final settlement can only come through war. God is with us."

Speaking in the Security Council in January 1957, Feroze Khan Noon said: "It is sometimes argued that everything is peaceful in Kashmir, so why bother? I warn you that it is a calm before the storm. Please do not be misled by the fact that we are peaceful."

In a public meeting at Chittagong on December 29, 1958,

President Ayub Khan stated: "Pakistan will consider no sacrifice too great to ensure the liberation of the people of Kashmir. We are prepared to stake everything for freeing Kashmir."

In an interview given to foreign correspondents he referred to the adoption of "extreme measures". Asked if he meant war, General Ayub said, "Yes, certainly."

About the same time, the "President of Azad Kashmir" also declared, "The liberation of Kashmir is a question of life and death for Pakistan and the people of Kashmir, and they were determined to achieve their objective at all costs."

The same threatening language was used by the spokesman of Pakistan at the Security Council meeting held in March 1964.

Dozens of such statements whose virulence grew with Pakistani military strength can be cited.

Identically the same process applies to the efforts of Pakistani leaders to incite and inflame communal passions both in Pakistan and India. Calls for a *jehad* against "Bharat the infidel" became more and more inflammatory together with the preaching of the doctrine that the philosophies of Islam and Hinduism were utterly incompatible and contradictory. This spread alarm among East Pakistani Hindus for it clearly implied that they could not enjoy the most elementary right of citizenship, viz. the protection of their life and property, not only from fanatical riotmongers but even from the official custodians of law and order.

Terrorisation and violence against Hindus and border provocations against India also increased in the same measure. Migration of Hindus from East Pakistan to India assumed alarming proportions in 1956. They were subjected to extreme violence and incendiarism in certain districts in 1961 and again in 1964.

Border incidents increased from 1955, reaching the number of 405 in 1961, 473 in 1962 and so on until they assumed the proportion of major military operations in 1965 on the Kutch border and at last, the present invasion.

Again and again, from 1949, Pandit Nehru offered to sign a no-war agreement with Pakistan banning the use of force for the settlement of any dispute between the two states. Repeated meetings were held between Indian Cabinet members and their opposites in Pakistan, between administrative and military officers from both sides and between Pandit Nehru and the Prime Minister of Pakistan himself. All of them came to nothing, and for the simple and basic reason that Pakistan knew that the political sympathy, diplomatic skill and armed strength of SEATO and CENTO or more bluntly, of the Anglo-American powers, always stood behind it. That was the mailed fist behind all negotiations and talks.

Experience pertaining to the present aggression of Pakistan against India is too fresh to need much description. But this instance also corroborates what is stated above.

The Anglo-Americans refused to pay heed to India's protests against the armed infiltrators when they started pouring across the ceasefire line in their thousands after 5th August.

It was only when Indian troops proceeded beyond Uri (the ceasefire line) to close the vulnerable Uri-Poonch bulge from which the main mass of the infiltrators had advanced and threatened Srinagar, that Anglo-American official spokesmen and newspapers started shouting about the violation of the ceasefire line.

Again, when Pakistani troops invaded Jammu across the international border near Chhamb, the Anglo-Americans kept quiet. But the moment Indian armies in sheer self-defence, advanced towards Lahore from Amritsar to save the only road connecting Jammu and Srinagar from the threatening Pakistani army, the Anglo-Americans immediately started howling about aggression and the violation of the international frontiers.

Despite the clear report by General Nimmo and the UNO Secretary-General U Thant that Pakistani infiltrators had invaded India from 5th August, the Anglo-Americans opposed any mention of that date in the first ceasefire resolution placed

before the Security Council meeting at the beginning of August. And they supported Pakistan's demand for linking up the question of ceasefire with the political settlement of the "Kashmir dispute". It was only the Soviet opposition that deterred them from pressing their view to a vote.

Later, the Anglo-Americans have taken the position of stopping arms supplies both to India and Pakistan. But their stooges in the CENTO, Turkey and Iran have promised to supply oil and arms to Pakistan, which is impossible for either of them without the sanction of the Anglo-American powers.

It is argued that when the Pak-American military alliance was signed, President Eisenhower assured Pandit Nehru that "if our aid to Pakistan is misused or directed for aggression (meaning India) I will undertake immediately appropriate action, both within and without the United Nations to thwart such aggression."

It is argued further that the USA cannot be held responsible for the misuse of American arms. It is all a case of Pakistan's duplicity, of Pakistan having cheated its military ally by giving him the impression that the arms were received for "defence against communism" while Pakistan actually accepted them for aggression against India.

This is a totally indefensible argument. There is no question about Pakistan's chicanery and opportunism which have been proved to the hilt on many issues and occasions.

The point is that the USA has failed blatantly (in truth, declined) to thwart Pakistani aggression against India according to its written pledge.

The use of Anglo-American arms by India is subject to their inspection which they carry out very rigorously while absolutely no such condition is imposed on Pakistan.

The USA and UK have consistently supplied Pakistan with far more powerful weapons (planes and tanks) than to India even though India wanted them on payment and not as a free gift as they have been given to Pakistan.

At the time of Pakistan's clear aggression in Kutch, the Anglo-Americans brought every pressure, not on Pakistan but on India, not to repel the aggressor by force. In contrast when the Indian army had to capture the heights of Kargil a few months ago for the proved reason that Pakistan had attempted to cut the Srinagar-Leh road, the Americans promptly called on India to withdraw behind the "ceasefire" line.

Lastly, it can never be forgotten that force is an instrument of politics. Throughout the last 18 years the Anglo-Americans have consistently supported (in fact, as shown earlier, initiated) Pakistan's demand for a plebiscite in Kashmir under UNO auspices. They have been wanting to get hold of Kashmir from India for military strategic purposes. That is the conclusive proof that one of the vital objectives of the imperialist powers in giving arms aid to Pakistan is to bring military pressure on India for the surrender of Kashmir.

The responsibility for Pakistani aggression against India, aggression which Pakistan could never have dared to commit without the massive military strength the imperialists gave it, lies squarely and primarily on the Anglo-Americans. The conspirators behind it are the imperialists. That is proved to the hilt, except, of course, to the imperialists and their henchmen, not excluding those in our country.

It cannot be denied and must be stated that China's role in the Indo-Pak conflict since 1960 has been of fishing in troubled waters for its own selfish anti-Indian designs and for that reason, to give opportunist support and aid to Pakistan against India. Much of what passes between the rulers of China and Pakistan is shrouded in secret diplomacy and mystery. But their collusion in practice is as glaring as sunlight.

It was after China started probing the Indian borders, first in Ladakh and then in NEFA, that it came to an illegal agreement with Pakistan with regard to the borders of occupied Kashmir and Sinkiang. By this agreement, Pakistan surrendered part of the border territory (which did not belong to it) to China for which it got a *quid pro quo* in return.

This *quid pro quo* was that it was about this time that China came out with a public statement that while it desired(!) a peaceful settlement of Indo-Pak differences, it was neutral on the question of whether Kashmir belonged juridically to India or Pakistan.

With the passage of time, China increasingly took the position that not Pakistan but India was taking aggressive postures. It went to the shocking extent of defending Pakistan's membership of SEATO and CENTO as being necessitated by the danger of Pakistan being attacked by India.

This was followed by concern for the right of self-determination of the people of Kashmir. Pakistan paid back the debt by invading India from Kargil to cut off the only military road from Srinagar to Ladakh, the life-line for India's defence of Ladakh from Chinese aggression.

And now China has come out in open glorification of the infiltrator brigands as liberators and as the leaders of a popular uprising in Kashmir against India's domination and rule. It has condemned India as the aggressor and demanded self-determination for Kashmir.

As the invading Pakistani armies have been successfully held and thrown back by the patriotic and valiant Indian forces, China has now given an ultimatum to India to dismantle its military installations in Sikkim within three days or face the consequences.

Both China and Pakistan are guilty of blatant and unprovoked aggression against India, individually and separately and in collusion.

It is precisely in contrast with all this imperialist blackmail and bullying, the vicious communalism, duplicity and military adventurism of the rulers of Pakistan, and the cynical opportunism and chauvinism of the rulers of China that the principled and friendly policy of the Soviet Union towards India stands out boldly by its sincerity, unselfishness and good intentions.

The Soviet Union has always wanted, as does India, relations of peace, goodwill and cooperation between India and Pakistan. It has wanted that both should be able to concentrate their resources and energy on building their economy and raising the standard of living of their people. It has wanted to strengthen their economic and political independence. It has wanted the end of all imperialist intervention, economic, political and military, in the two countries, as also in their mutual relations. It has wanted them to settle their differences by direct, peaceful negotiations with such assistance from genuinely friendly countries as both may desire.

In the pursuit of this policy, from the very first meeting of the Security Council on the Kashmir question in January 1948, it has taken the clear position that the state of Jammu and Kashmir is an integral part of India.

The Soviet Union in the Security Council and Czechoslovakia in the UNCIP have consistently exposed Anglo-American intrigues and pressures to inject foreign armed forces into Kashmir and detach it from India whether in the name of a free and fair plebiscite for self-determination, in the name of arbitration on truce terms, in the name of practical proposals like the tri-partition of Kashmir or in the name of having an "independent" Kashmir, by giving it the alluring and poetic name of the "Switzerland of the East."

The Soviet Union was the first, and down to this day, is the only major power in the world, to give massive technical assistance to India for laying the base of metallurgical, chemical and engineering industries, of steel, oil, power and machine-tools, which alone can be the foundation of India's economic and political independence and the basis of India's independence in military equipment.

More. It is the Soviet Union and the socialist countries that have helped India to build armament factories. They have not only given us the magnificent MIG planes, more than a match for the formidable planes which the Americans gave to Pakistan

and refused to give us, but are helping us to manufacture those planes in India.

The Soviet Union has given us submarines and other military equipment which the Anglo-Americans refused, and has continued to execute all its contracts for the delivery of military equipment irrespective of developments in Indo-Chinese or Indo-Pak relations.

The question is asked whether we can always rely on Soviet aid, even by those who do not deny its generosity and value so far as the past is concerned.

The assurance of the continuity of such aid lies in the simple fact that the Soviet Union and socialist countries are genuinely interested in peace, in friendly relations between all countries, in colonial liberation and in the strengthening of the economic and political independence of the newly-independent countries.

It is said that no country in the world can pursue such a foreign policy just for the sake of altruism. The reply to this position is also simple and straightforward. All the above mentioned objectives are unquestionably in the national interest of the Soviet Union and the socialist countries themselves. They never deny this or make any effort to cover up the fact. But the objectives, and the policies emanating from them are also in the common interest of the socialist countries and all the countries and people in the world who want freedom, peace and progress.

This is the assurance, and no more can be given or asked for, that Soviet economic, political, diplomatic, technical and military policies towards India will continue as firmly in the future as in the past.

Indo-Soviet friendship and cooperation are based on solid mutual interest, and that too, not of any kind that is directed against the true interest of any other country.

That is the assurance of their stability and continuity.

KASHMIR AND SELF-DETERMINATION

A curious combination of the Anglo-American powers, the rulers of Pakistan, the rulers of China and some others has been demanding self-determination for Kashmir with growing insistence. The same combination accuses India of suppressing this democratic right of the people of Kashmir. The heroic though also tragic history of Kashmir briefly narrated in this pamphlet has itself thrown light on the true meaning of self-determination for Kashmir. But a summing up of the question would be useful since it is being raised once again in the context of the present armed conflict between India and Pakistan and consistent efforts to misguide honest opinion outside India are being assiduously made.

The Anglo-American demand for a plebiscite in Kashmir can be treated with the contempt it deserves. The imperialists who have always attempted to crush national liberation movements by violence, and have never given freedom to any of their colonies or dependent countries except when they have been thrown out by national liberation struggles, have no right to talk of self-determination for Kashmir. Besides, so far as Kashmir is specifically concerned, they have thoroughly exposed themselves by their intrigues to get a hold over it for strategic military purposes under the garb of supporting "independent" Kashmir.

For many years and in reality, till now, the Pakistani demand for a plebiscite in Kashmir was based openly on the "two nation" theory, in accordance with which all the Hindus of the Indian subcontinent form one nation, and all the Muslims, another. Nationality being equated with religion, the Muslim League leaders just could not understand, at least claimed not to understand, why the people of Kashmir considered themselves an integral part of India and not of Pakistan. Naturally the rulers of Pakistan will never agree that the people of Kashmir have become free, have been "liberated",

until and unless they join Pakistan just because they are Muslims.

In fact, the theory of Muslims being a nation is fast cracking up in Pakistan itself with the growing struggle for autonomy and freedom of the people of East Pakistan, the Pakhtoons and the Baluchis.

President Ayub, in recent years, has learned the language of anti-colonialism, self-determination, people's rights and so on. So now he speaks of the right of the people of Kashmir to self-determination against India's colonial domination over Kashmir.

However, he still calls upon the people of Kashmir to revolt against India as Muslims, and the people of Pakistan to liberate their Muslim brethren in Kashmir in the name of Allah and a *jihad*.

No democrat can ever accept that the principle of self-determination can or should be applied to a community based on religion. Self-determination is a right of nationhood, not of religious groups. If it is attempted to be applied to the latter it can only lead to communal bloodshed and violence on a mass scale, as proved by experience, overpowering the most elementary human values, not to speak of democracy and freedom.

It must also be pointed out that the rulers of Pakistan from the very beginning, and far more so after the establishment of the Ayub military dictatorship, have never cared to introduce any democracy in Pakistan, as also in occupied Kashmir, while championing the cause of freedom and self-determination for that part of Kashmir which they failed to grab by force. Both democracy and national movements in Pakistan are ruthlessly suppressed. And we see the amazing spectacle of a brutal military dictator in Pakistan championing the cause of democracy and self-determination in Kashmir.

The Chinese leaders' demand for giving the right of self-determination to the people of Kashmir, is a new discovery, even for themselves. Never for once did they suggest any such thing to anybody before five or six years. And they are cer-

tainly not so ignorant of the problem as not to know that the demand has been raised on a blatantly religious basis and has nothing to do with national self-determination.

Their support for the demand can have only one meaning, which in recent years is plain enough for all honest and impartial people. They share with Pakistan what is almost a morbid anti-Indian hatred, and also the design to disintegrate and dismember India for the purpose of territorial aggrandisement.

Whatever the aims and motives of the imperialists, the rulers of Pakistan, and the rulers of China may be, all honest democrats in or out of India, must also clearly understand the true meaning of the principle of self-determination as applied to Kashmir.

Prior to the attainment of national independence in 1947, the people of India were under British rule and domination. This was true not only for the great majority which was under direct British rule. This was essentially true also for the people in the Indian princely states. The only difference was that British imperialism, while firmly holding in its hands the essence of political power had additionally imposed its servile puppets, the feudal princes, on the people in the princely states. The British power never made a secret of the fact that the princes had to serve as their subservient instrument. That was stated in the very "treaties" in accordance with which they were enthroned as rulers by the British power. Many Viceroys reminded them of this status whenever they thought it necessary to do so.

The purpose of the British power in creating the princely order (nearly six hundred rajahs, maharajas, nababs etc.) was to secure firm and subordinate allies against any prospective anti-imperialist popular struggles, as also to keep the Indian people divided.

The people in the princely states thus groaned under a double yoke. The medieval, thoroughly despotic, feudal princes and behind them, or rather above them, the power of British imperialism.

National awakening, organisation and struggles naturally grew first in what was then called British India (as distinguished from princely India, which was then referred to simply as "the states"). However, decades later, particularly in the nineteen thirties a powerful states' people's movement for freedom and democracy also surged forward.

Most naturally and necessarily, the states' people's movement received its inspiration, support and guidance from the broad national movement for freedom. There were many leading personalities in the national movement who, coming originally from the states, were also leaders of the popular movement in their states.

The national movement led by the Indian National Congress had hundreds and hundreds of cadres who also participated in the states' people's movement. The leadership of the Congress, headed by Mahatma Gandhi had sympathy for and gave help to the states' people's movement on occasions, though it also tried to impose strict restrictions on it, since it did not suit its interest to come into any serious conflict with the princes while struggling against the British. The class interests of the leadership of the Indian National Congress led it to such compromises.

The application of the principle of self-determination whether to "British India" or "Princely India", had no meaning in those days, and has no meaning even now, except in the context summarised above. And this is not a matter of argument or abstract logic but of massive historical facts.

In the context mentioned above, the objective of the national movement in India, "British" as also "princely", an objective repeated a million times in the very thick of fiery mass struggles, was the ending of British rule and domination, the ending of feudal princely rule, and the unification of the whole of India as a free, democratic, sovereign state. This and this alone, was the meaning of the exercise of the right of self-determination as understood by the Indian people, by the millions who fought and suffered for it, by the thousands of

Indian martyrs who laid down their life for its realisation in "British" and "princely" India alike.

What was to be the physical embodiment of the freedom, unity, sovereignty and democracy visualised by the movement? The Constituent Assembly elected on the basis of free, adult franchise. The Indian National Congress officially gave the slogan in 1937 and it was also given by the states' people's movement in a number of states. The slogan of a single Constituent Assembly for the whole of India could not be given at that time since the level of the movement in "British India" and the "states" was uneven, and no one could say whether freedom could be achieved in a synchronised way by both. Besides, though in spirit the national movement was united, the juridical separation of the states from British India was still there.

The purpose of explaining this whole background is to pinpoint the fact that it was *precisely* in the sense and manner described above that the heroic people of Kashmir, having abolished princely rule in Kashmir, and having fought and defeated the desperate British effort to reimpose its hold over Kashmir through the barbarous tribal invasion, decided to exercise their right of self-determination, their urge to merge, to unite with India in 1947. The accession of Kashmir to India in October 1947, signed and sealed in law by the powerless Maharaja was but a British constitutional form of the irresistible urge for freedom and unity with India of the fighting people of Kashmir. It was the shell of the vital, living, kernel of the verdict of the people.

The people of India and Kashmir were not divided voluntarily, because they wanted to do so. They were separated by brute force, by the British power, in 1846, by making a gift of Kashmir to its hireling and stooge, Maharaja Gulab Singh, formerly an army general of Maharaja Ranjit Singh. And the gift was made as a reward for the services rendered by Gulab Singh to the British for crushing the patriotic, independent, and anti-British Sikh state in the Punjab ruled over by the illustrious

Ranjit Singh. This is stated so in black and white in the *Kharita* given by the British to Gulab Singh in 1848. The separation of Kashmir from India was thus the result of the price of treachery paid by the then advancing British power to the perfidious Dogra general, Gulab Singh. All that the people of Kashmir did in 1947 was to wipe out this crime of the British and their hireling.

In the midst of the struggle for throwing out the invaders, the people of Kashmir could not naturally convene a Constituent Assembly within a few weeks or months. But, as described earlier, that was done within a few years, and it was the people's freedom movement of Kashmir led by the National Conference that once again confirmed Kashmir's accession to India, through its Constituent Assembly, elected in 1951 on the basis of adult suffrage.

Was the Constituent Assembly a free and independent body? Only feudal reactionaries or believers in the "two nation" theory or imperialist agents can ask such a question. In Indian condition what was, and is, the meaning of freedom and independence, if not the ending of British domination in all its forms, the abolition of feudal rule and privileges? And if a body, an institution, which achieved these aims was not free and independent, who was? The Constituent Assembly of Kashmir, in fact, gave freedom a deeper and richer content, a popular and democratic content, by abolishing feudal ownership of land without compensation. If this was not freedom, what else is?

And who else could be the guarantor of the freedom and independence of the Constituent Assembly if not the flood tide of the people's mass movement for freedom as channelled and led by the Kashmir National Conference, the instrument forged and welded by the freedom movement itself?

All the Security Council resolutions oozing unctiousness and compassion for the "oppressed" people of Kashmir and calling for a free and independent plebiscite under the auspices of UNO, all the shrill shrieking by the Ayub dictatorship demanding the same, is not only hypocritical and dishonest, it is

a crime against the people of Kashmir themselves. It is nothing but a call for the reimposition of imperialist domination masquerading as the champion of self-determination, while denouncing the genuine exercise of the right of self-determination as fraud and violence, as the annexation of Kashmir by India, as the imposition of Indian colonial rule over Kashmir.

Much is said about the former beloved leader of the people of Kashmir, Sheikh Abdullah, having defected from his earlier position and gone over to the support of "independent" Kashmir. In fact that is the biggest shield behind which the imperialists and their supporters now take cover.

This is not the place, nor is it necessary here, to go into the sad story of how the vanity and ambition of Sheikh Abdullah, despite all his other good qualities, led him into the criminal trap set by the Americans to secure his sponsorship of "independent" Kashmir. Incontrovertible and voluminous evidence of how the bottomless purse of the dollar empire was placed before him in the name of building an "independent and prosperous Switzerland of the East", has been published and has long since been available for anyone who cares to read it. Among many other "illustrious" Anglo-Americans, no less a person than Chester Bowles, US Ambassador to India in 1952, openly took a hand in bringing about the desertion of Sheikh Abdullah from the aims and ideals for which he had fought throughout his earlier career.

The best reply to those who now take cover behind Sheikh Abdullah, therefore, is to quote verbatim from his own speech before the Kashmir Constituent Assembly on the question of Kashmir's accession to India and the other alternatives:

"I shall first speak on the merits and demerits of the state's accession to India. In the final analysis, as I understand it, it is the kinship of ideals which determines the strength of ties between two states. The Indian National Congress has consistently supported the cause of the states' people's freedom. The autocratic rule of the princes has been done away with and

representative governments have been entrusted with the administration. Steps towards democratisation have been taken and these have raised the people's standard of living, brought about much needed social reconstruction, and, above all, built up their very independence of spirit. Naturally, if we accede to India there is no danger of a revival of feudalism and autocracy. Moreover, during the last four years, the Government of India has never tried to interfere in our internal autonomy. This experience has strengthened our confidence in them as a democratic state.

"The real character of a state is revealed in its Constitution. The Indian Constitution has set before the country the goal of secular democracy based upon justice, freedom and equality for all without distinction. This is the bed-rock of modern democracy. This should meet the argument that the Muslims of Kashmir cannot have security in India, where the large majority of the population are Hindus. Any unnatural cleavage between religious groups is the legacy of imperialism, and no modern state can afford to encourage artificial divisions if it is to achieve progress and prosperity. The Indian Constitution has amply and finally repudiated the concept of a religious state, which is a throwback to medievalism, by guaranteeing the equality of rights of all citizens irrespective of their religion, colour, caste and class.

"The national movement in our state naturally gravitates towards these principles of secular democracy. The people here will never accept a principle which seeks to favour the interests of one religion or social group against another. This affinity in political principles, as well as in past association, and our common path of suffering in the cause of freedom, must be weighed properly while deciding the future of the state.

"We are also intimately concerned with the economic well-being of the people of this state. As I said before while referring to constitution-building, political ideals are often meaningless unless linked with economic plans... As you know, and

as I have detailed before we have been able to put through our 'land to the tiller' legislation.

"The most powerful argument which can be advanced in favour of Pakistan is that it is a Muslim state, and, a big majority of our people being Muslims, the state must accede to Pakistan. This claim of being a Muslim state is of course only a camouflage. It is a screen to dupe the common man, so that he may not see clearly that Pakistan is a feudal state in which a clique is trying by these methods to maintain itself in power.

"In addition to this, the appeal to religion constitutes a sentimental and a wrong approach to the question. Sentiment has its own place in life, but often it leads to irrational action. Some argue, as a supposedly natural corollary to this, that on our acceding to Pakistan our annihilation or survival depends. Facts have disproved this. Right-thinking men would point out that Pakistan is not an organic unity of all the Muslims in this sub-continent. It has, on the contrary, caused the dispersion of the Indian Muslims for whose benefit it was claimed to have been created. There are two Pakistans at least a thousand miles apart from each other. The total population of Western Pakistan, which is contiguous to our state, is hardly 25 million while the total number of Muslims resident in India is as many as 40 millions.

"As one Muslim is as good as another, the Kashmiri Muslims, if they are worried by such considerations, should choose the 40 millions living in India.

"Looking at the matter too from a more modern political angle, religious affinities alone do not and should not normally determine the political alliance of states. We do not find a Christian bloc, a Buddhist bloc, or even a Muslim bloc, about which there is so much talk nowadays in Pakistan. These days economic interests and a community of political ideals more appropriately influence the policies of states.

"The third course open to us still has to be discussed. We have to consider the alternative of making ourselves an

Eastern Switzerland, of keeping aloof from both states but having friendly relations with them. This might seem attractive in that it would appear to pave the way out of the present deadlock. To us as a tourist country it would also have obvious advantages. But in considering independence we must not ignore practical consideration.

"Firstly, it is not easy to protect our sovereignty and independence in a small country which has not sufficient strength to defend itself on our long and difficult frontiers bordering on many countries.

"Secondly, we must have the good-will of all our neighbours. Can we find powerful guarantors among them to pull together always in assuring us freedom from aggression? I would like to remind you that from August 15 to October 26 of 1947 our state was independent and the result was that our weakness was exploited by our neighbour, with whom we had a valid standstill agreement. The state was invaded. What is the guarantee that, in future too, we may not be the victim of similar aggression?"

No comment is needed.

We shall end by a reference to the speech of Sobolev, the Soviet representative in the Security Council, in January 1957. He said:

"The Security Council is once again discussing the so-called 'Kashmir question'. As is known, this question first appeared before the Security Council more than nine years ago. At that time it was raised as a question of protecting the population of Kashmir from the hostile activities of certain tribes coming from Pakistan territory and later against the activities of regular Pakistani troops. Subsequently, in the course of the discussion of that question in the Security Council, the original meaning of the question was changed and the Security Council, unfortunately, focussed its attention not on assistance in solving the question of Kashmir under the conditions of a direct agreement between the parties, but on the preparation of a plebiscite with interference from outside.

“Of course, such a policy is in complete contradiction to the real interests of the Kashmiri people, who are attempting to carry out a peaceful and creative life and who have no desire to become the objective of imperialist designs.

“In an attempt to put an end to the vague and indefinite status and to establish political stability, the Kashmir people in 1951 elected a Constituent Assembly. This Constituent Assembly passed a number of important laws, including a law in 1954 which confirmed the accession of the state of Jammu and Kashmir to India. In 1956, the Constituent Assembly of Kashmir adopted the Constitution of the state, according to which the state would enjoy rights of autonomy within the Republic of India.

“Thus the question of Kashmir has been settled by the people of Kashmir themselves. They decided that Kashmir is an integral part of the Republic of India. The Security Council cannot overlook these facts.”

The people of Kashmir themselves have finally and irrevocably decided the question of their right of self-determination. The people of Kashmir and India have decided that they will remain united and free, that their destiny and future are indivisible. No imperialists and no Ayub Khans can alter the decision by an iota. The magnificent manner in which the people of Kashmir have risen once again, in the present invasion of Kashmir, to defend the unity and integrity of India from the barbarous Pakistani raiders is the final and the most brilliant proof of this truth, if any is needed. They have written it across the pages of history in letters of blood.

STRENGTHEN THE REAR

Indian troops are giving a magnificent account of themselves at the front with exemplary skill and courage. They are defending the sovereignty and territorial integrity of their motherland without a moment's thought for their life or safety. They have

repelled the enemy's attack and are giving him crushing counter-blows.

They are also setting the country a glorious example of the unity of all the people of India from Kashmir to Kerala, from Gujarat to Assam, the unity of our multi-lingual, multi-religious people. Highest awards for bravery are being won by soldiers and airmen of all ranks whether Hindu, Muslim, Sikh, Parsi or Christian; whether speaking Hindi, Bengali, Marathi, Tamil or any other language of India.

The jawans have become the symbol of our freedom and unity.

The model set before the country by its sons fighting on the front is a mandate for us to fulfil our obligations to them and to our country. The more so because the peril is yet to be warded off, and is growing because of the new Chinese threat on our northern borders.

The people all over the country are rushing to donate blood, and to participate in civil defence as volunteers for fighting rumours, for strengthening popular morale, for various kinds of social service, for air-raid assistance and so on. That is naturally the immediate urgent task.

But that is not enough. If we understand what Pakistan backed by the imperialists is fighting for, and what India is fighting against, then we have also to work tirelessly for giving flesh and blood to our national ideals which give meaning to our freedom and patriotism. Only thus will the people of India be worthy of the martyrdom which our jawans are laying at the altar of the motherland.

The consolidation of communal harmony and the strengthening of secular democracy, of course, come first. But secular democracy is not just a phrase. It certainly means giving full protection to the minorities; the creation of an atmosphere which will remove any apprehension in their mind that their physical safety or property are in danger of molestation; giving them the assurance not only in law but in practice that they can

enjoy all the rights of Indian citizenship and get full opportunities to make their due contribution to the cause of national defence.

It means more. It means faith in Hindu-Muslim unity based on the conviction that irrespective of difference in religion Hindus and Muslims are politically one because they are Indians first, because what matters in public life for both is their loyalty to their country which stands for freedom, equality, democracy and economic progress. No one who lacks such a conviction, who harbours the feeling that prima facie a member of the minority is suspect until and unless he demonstrates his loyalty to the country in one or another form, no one who harbours such feelings can claim to believe in the patriotic unity of Indians as Indians, irrespective of differences in religion, caste, language or creed. Not to mince words, such a suspicious outlook cannot, in honesty, claim to believe in the territorial integrity and indivisibility of India.

That is why the consistent and invidious propaganda and activities of the Jana Sangh and Hindu communalism must be systematically exposed and fought by all those who believe in Indian secular patriotism, in the territorial integrity of our country. It is Pakistan which considers the Hindus in Pakistan as Indian hostages to be abused, humiliated and physically attacked for subjecting India to the pressures of power politics, to invite reprisals in India, and in their name, again, to appeal to the Muslims in Kashmir to cross over to the side of Pakistan. No patriotic Indian can even dream of paying Pakistan in its own coin.

No decent Indian with the remotest sense of truth and justice can think of doing so when the Muslims in Kashmir themselves have stood by secularism and the territorial integrity of India for eighteen years at the cost of blood and tears paid by lakhs and lakhs of Kashmiri men and women. No patriotic Indian, again, can think in such terms when the blood of Hindu and Muslim jawans is mingling in a common stream for the defence of the motherland in the battlefields in Punjab and Kashmir.

A vital task of all democrats and patriots today is therefore to counter all attempts and propaganda by Hindu reaction for putting any political, psychological or physical pressure on the minority community.

Our central and state governments also have to give up the policy, which is being followed by the administration though not officially declared as such, of an indiscriminate arrest and detention of Muslims. Members of the Communist Party who can never be accused of communalism, Congressmen whose patriotism cannot be challenged, honest doctors and lawyers, so many have been arrested, subjected to humiliating interrogation and detained just because they belong to the minority community. This is impermissible and must end.

Does this mean we can afford to give up vigilance against enemy spies and fifth columnists? Not at all. Every citizen must be vigilant all the twenty-four hours against such enemy activity. The paratroopers are there. Pakistani spies are there. They must be properly dealt with. But this has nothing in common with the persecution or manhandling of a person on suspicion just because he belongs to a particular community. Principles apart, Hindu, Christian, Sikh and other Pakistani spies have been found and arrested. No community has a monopoly of patriotism, or carries with it the stigma of national betrayal.

The persistent propaganda whether open or through whisper campaigns, of the Swatantra Party, the Jana Sangh and other rightist elements that not the Soviet Union and the socialist countries but the USA and Britain are our trustworthy friends, because, as they say, the real enemy is China, has also to be exposed.

Of course, China has chosen to be our enemy and we shall fight any attack from China with no less determination and vigour than the one from Pakistan. But Anglo-American perfidy and Soviet loyalty towards India have been demonstrated too massively and too long for such propaganda and canvassing to be tolerated by any patriotic Indian.

At the moment, right-reaction has been silenced by the immensity of the Anglo-American crime expressed in the Pakistani tanks and planes that are the spear-head of Pakistan's sanguinary assault on India. But it will raise its head again. The mischief can take any form, any plan, any suggestion of a political and military line-up between India and the Anglo-Americans and a break in Indo-Soviet relations. This danger must be consistently exposed and resisted.

No country in the world has succeeded in conducting such a grim armed conflict for survival as we are conducting today without keeping a grip on its internal economy, without putting down with an iron hand the hoarders, profiteers and black-marketeers, without meeting the just economic demands of the working class, the peasantry and the middle classes, who provide the sinews of war, the weapons with which the army defends the country.

But this is just the sphere in which our government, dominated by capitalist interests, is failing most.

The working class all over India has come out voluntarily for increasing production and for settling wage disputes through negotiations. As always, it has proved its patriotism by deeds, not just by wordy declamations.

The government must come forward and compel the employers to settle just working class demands about wages, bonus, DA, etc. across the negotiating table. Forcing workers to resort to strikes must be prohibited and drastically punished.

The same treatment must be meted out to traders in all essential commodities, food, clothes, medicines, etc. who resort to raising prices, black-marketing and profiteering.

Rationing in all cities and towns with a population above one lakh, and provisioning in the rural areas, must be introduced without delay, and first and foremost in chronically deficit areas and states.

Monopoly and effective state purchase of foodgrains, and a compulsory grain levy on landlords and rich peasants criminally postponed by the government for years, cannot wait any longer.

This measure is a must for the strengthening of the rear in times of war.

The question of democratic liberties and the release of political prisoners has become extremely urgent. We cannot fight for democracy while seriously jeopardising it at home. The release of political prisoners is also demanded for full and hearty cooperation by all political parties in India in the cause of national defence. The government cannot invite support from people behind the prison bars.

These are our tasks, the tasks of all democratic and patriotic parties and elements in India who love freedom, who are pledged to defend the country, no matter what the cost may be.

India is passing through its grimmest ordeal since achieving freedom. Let us face it with courage and determination, confident that the cause of freedom, democracy and peace, the cause of restoring neighbourly relations between India and Pakistan, will triumph in the end. India, with its ancient culture and human values has survived and advanced through numberless ordeals. It must and will emerge victorious from the present test as well.

POSTSCRIPT

As the pamphlet goes to the press, the ceasefire has come. It has been sincerely supported by patriotic opinion in India which desires nothing so much as a peaceful, democratic and principled solution of the Kashmir question.

Such tasks mentioned in this pamphlet as relate directly to the conditions of armed conflict have naturally no relevance to the new situation.

But we are still passing through a period of great political tension and complications. A withdrawal of the armed personnel of both sides in a manner that will create a firm guarantee against the repetition of aggression by Pakistan has to be effected. Following on it is the underlying question of the settlement of political differences opening out all the dangers of

Anglo-American intervention direct and through the UNO, of which our country has been a victim for the last eighteen years.

This not only calls for constant vigilance but the pursuit of firm and principled policies, surely imbued with the earnest desire to restore neighbourly relations with Pakistan.

The entire problem is rendered still more grave by the fact that India has now got to assume that China is going to put its strength behind Pakistan and resort to various pressures on India for achieving its objectives as also those of Pakistan, directed against India.

In the tasks which lie ahead of us in much a grave and difficult situation, it is hoped that the historical material and analysis presented by this pamphlet would be useful for all people interested in a just solution of the Indo-Pak conflict over Kashmir.

I would also like to append, at the end, the declaration made by Sheikh Abdullah at the opening session of the Kashmir Constituent Assembly in 1951 as also the precise words of the Constitution adopted by it relating to Kashmir's integration with India.

Sheikh Abdullah said: "You are the sovereign authority in this State of Jammu and Kashmir; what you decide has the irrevocable force of law."

The Preamble of the Constitution, adopted by the Constituent Assembly in 1956 states:

"We, the people of the State of Jammu and Kashmir, having solemnly resolved, in pursuance of the accession of this State to India which took place on the twentysixth day of October, 1947, to further define the existing relationship of the State with the Union of India as an integral part thereof... in our Constituent Assembly, this seventeenth day of November, 1956, do hereby adopt, enact and give to ourselves this Constitution."

Then follows the section affirming Kashmir's relation with India. It says:

"The State of Jammu and Kashmir is and shall be an integral part of the Union of India."

September 23, 1965